

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgiria 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,585	02/05/2001	E. Stephen Crandall	105136.01	9273
0990A2008 MR. S. H. SWORETSKY AT&T CORP. ROOM 2A-207 ONE AT&T WAY BEDMINSTER. NJ 07921			EXAMINER	
			SHINGLES, KRISTIE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 09/775,585 CRANDALL, E. STEPHEN Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit KRISTIE D. SHINGLES 2141 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 39-54 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 39-54 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner, Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/fi.iall Date ______.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 09/775,585 Page 2

Art Unit: 2141

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

Claims 1-38 have been cancelled. Claims 39-54 have been amended.

Claims 39-54 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39 and 46 have been considered but are
moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- II. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- III. <u>Claims 39 54</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beach et al (US 6,728,713) in view of Greer et al (US 5,978,828).

Application/Control Number: 09/775,585

Art Unit: 2141

a. Per claims 39 and 46 (differ only by statutory class), Beach et al teach the method for receiving performance content over a network for generating a pseudo-live performance, the method comprising:

- detecting a need for the performance content by determining that stored performance content is out-of-date (col.6 lines 35-56, col.15 lines 4-11);
- selecting a process for obtaining the needed performance content (col.7 lines 3-18);
- executing the process for obtaining the needed performance content (col.7 lines 15-36); and
- generating the pseudo-live performance by mixing content corresponding to one
 or more portions of the needed performance content with other content (col.12
 line 15-col.13 line 6)
- accessing a time-stamp of the stored performance content (col.16 lines 55-58),
- determining whether the time-stamp of the stored performance content matches the time of the latest update of the stored performance content (col.11 line 62col.12 line 2.col.14 lines 45-51, col.16 lines 51-67).

Yet Beach et al fail to explicitly teach determining whether stored program content is out-of-date further comprises: transmitting a query to determine a time of a latest update of the stored performance content, receiving the time of latest update of the stored performance content in response to the transmitting of the query. However Greer et al teach querying to receive update information to determine a time of the last update/modification, accessing the timestamp of the webpage object and determining if the stored object has been updated (col.3 line 64-col.4 line 31, col.5 line 22-col.6 line 25, col.7 lines 35-45, col.8 lines 23-52, col.9 lines 1-10).

Application/Control Number: 09/775,585

Art Unit: 2141

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Page 4

invention was made to combine the teachings of Beach et al with Greer et al for the purpose of

determining that stored data is old or out-of-date by comparing latest update times and time-

stamps. Time-stamping and maintaining the date and time of content modifications are common

techniques used in the art for effectively implementing updates, synchronizing data and keeping

track of the current version of stored content in order to keep the stored content up-to-date.

b. **Per claim 40**, Beach et al with Greer et al teach the method of claim 39, Beach et

al further teach the method further comprising: accessing a profile wherein the profile indicates

one or more of: a type of content desired by an end-user; a schedule of an end-user; and

scheduled times at which content is transmitted by a performance transmitter (col.3 lines 44-48,

col.15 line 44-col.16 line 50, col.17 line 16-col.18 line 37).

Claim 47 is substantially similar to claim 40 and is therefore rejected under the

same basis.

Per claim 41, Beach et al with Greer et al teach the method of claim 39, Beach et

al further teach the method further comprising determining whether a performance transmitter is

of a type that is capable of receiving and responding to a content request, wherein the

determining further comprises one or more of: transmitting a query signal to a performance

transmitter; passively receiving a signal from the performance transmitter; and accessing a

profile (col.3 lines 44-48, col.15 line 44-col.16 line 50).

e. Claim 48 is substantially similar to claim 41 and is therefore rejected under the

same basis.

f. **Per claim 42**, Beach et al with Greer et al teach the method of claim 39, Beach et al further teach the method further comprising: generating a content request; and transmitting the request to a performance transmitter via the network (col.15 line 44-col.16 line 44; Greer et al—col.8 lines 30-52, col.9 lines 1-10).

- g. Claim 49 is substantially similar to claim 42 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.
- h. Per claim 43, Beach et al with Greer et al teach the method of claim 39, Beach et al further teach wherein the selecting a process comprises determining an appropriate time to receive information from a performance transmitter (col.16 lines 36-67, col.18 lines 40-67).
- Claim 50 is substantially similar to claim 43 and is therefore rejected under the same basis
- j. Per claim 44, Beach et al with Greer et al teach the method of claim 39, Beach et al further teach wherein generating the pseudo-live performance comprises: retrieving the other content; decoding one or more commands of the other content; and performing one or more tasks instructed by the commands (col.15 lines 12-51, col.20 lines 1-34).
- k. Claim 51 is substantially similar to claim 44 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.
- Per claim 45, Beach et al teach the method of claim 44, wherein the one or more
 commands includes one or more of programming commands that execute a software program,
 housekeeping commands that load, delete, change or overlay stored content, and performance
 commands that reproduce stored content from one or more specified locations of a storage device
 (col.11 line 62-col.12 line 2, col.14 lines 45-51, col.16 lines 51-67, col.18 lines 40-61).

 m. Claim 52 is substantially similar to claim 44 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

- n. **Per claim 53,** Beach et al with Greer et al teach the method of claim 39, Beach et al further teach wherein the performance content includes multimedia performance content (col.17 lines 1-32: Greer et al; col.3 lines 26-39).
- Claim 54 is substantially similar to claim 53 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

- IV. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: Abato et al (6513069), Reisman (6769009), Liu et al (6839680), Rajan et al (6633910), Silberstein et al (7383320).
- V. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kristie D. Shingles Examiner Art Unit 2141

/KDS/ /William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144